



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/481,984	01/11/2000	MICHAEL D. DOYLE	19850-2US	6418

20350 7590 11/27/2001

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

EL HADY, NABIL M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HG

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/481,984

Applicant(s)

DOYLE, MICHAEL D.

Examiner

Nabil M El-Hady

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 January 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-8 are pending in this application.
2. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.
3. The incorporation of essential material in the specification by reference to a foreign application or patent, or to a publication is improper. Applicant is required to amend the disclosure to indicate that this material is incorporated by reference. Also, ALL foreign applications or patents, or publications should be appropriately listed in Form PTO 1449.
4. The reference to a source code appendix in page 8, lines 12-13 is objected to for the following reasons: the computer program listing submitted with the application cannot be printed because the appendix is having over 300 lines. The computer program listing must be submitted on a compact disc in compliance with 1.52(e) and no other format shall be allowed (e.g. microfiche). A compact disc containing such computer program listing is to be referred to as a "computer program listing appendix". The "computer program listing appendix" will not be part of the printed patent. The specification must include a reference to the "computer program listing appendix" at the location indicated in 1.77(b)(4).
5. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed. However, the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show blocks 10, 12, and 14 as described in Page 5 of the specification. Any structural detail that is essential

Art Unit: 2154

for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Correction is required.

6. Claims 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "and" is repeated in lines 10 and 13. Appropriate correction is required.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following terms lack antecedent basis:

- a) "the standard embed tag parameters", claim 4, line 7;
- b) "the browser plug-in application", claim 4, line 11;
- c) "the scripting language platform", claim 4, lines 13;
- d) "the browser plug-in application", claim 7, line 10;

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant Admitted prior Art, hereafter "AAPA" in view of Guthrie (USPN 6,266,681 B1).

11. As to claim 1, AAPA discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a method for extending script language functionality utilizing web-browser plug-in applications, with the script language for implementing scripts defining interactive applications through run-time parsing and with the script language interpreted by an interpreter having standard application programming interfaces (APIs) for enhancing the command set and widget set of the interpreter through interpreter extensions loaded at run-time, the method, implemented by a plug-in interpreter extension (page 2, line 4 to page 3, line 14), the method comprising the steps of:

a) parsing a program script to locate an embed command, parsing the embed command to locate a source reference and source format information, and fetching an embedded object referenced by the source reference (page 2, lines 5-6, 28-30; and page 3, lines 5-8), and automatically invoking a browser plug-in application based on the source format information (page 2, lines 16-19, 23-24; and page 3, lines 10-14).

12. AAPA does not explicitly disclose creating a child window, controlled by the plug-in interpreter extension. Guthrie, on the other hand, discloses creating a child window, controlled by the plug-in interpreter extension to allow the plug-in application to display and interactively manipulate the embedded object (col. 3, lines 24-26). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of AAPA and Guthrie because Guthrie's child window would provide AAPA's method with additional user interface capability to the browser application which provide the user with immediate access to more applications.

Art Unit: 2154

13. As to claim 2, AAPA discloses utilizing a standard Internet protocol to fetch the object (page 2, lines 8-11).

14. As to claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition, AAPA discloses simulating a web-browser plug-in API to automatically invoke a plug-in application corresponding to the source format information (page 2, lines 16-19, 23-24; and page 3, lines 10-14).

15. As to claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

16. As to claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

17. As to claims 4-6, AAPA does not specifically disclose a computer program product comprising a computer readable storage structure for storing plug-in-interface extension program code for extending the functionality of a script interpreter platform by employing web-browser plug-in applications as components within script based programs, the program code comprising program codes for performing all the method steps in other claim. However, It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that performing these method steps, including allowing the plug-in application to display and provide interactive processing of a data and/or program object within a child window, would be obviously inherent in AAPA's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2154

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Davidson et al. (USPN 6083276), Kanungo (USPN 6266056 B1), Peyer (USPN 6188401 B1), Massenna et al. (USPN 6035119), Wies et al. (USPN 6161126).

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nabil M El-Hady whose telephone number is (703) 308-7990. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai T An can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7239 for regular communications and (703) 308-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Nabil El-Hady
November 19, 2001